

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application, none of which have been amended.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for containing subject matter that is not described in the specification in such a way to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

The present invention is related to an improved method for managing power consumption of a sending driver as well as a receiving driver, and not just for providing power management of a "wired" transmission line, as suggested by the Examiner. As explained in page 1, line 30 - page 2, line 5 of the specification, with a prior art sending driver, a sender will pass data to the sending driver when there are data needed to be sent by the sender. When there are no data needed to be sent, the sender may issue a control signal to power down the sending driver in order to save power. Basically, the prior art sending driver is only capable of either operating at a full power mode or an idling mode at low power. The present invention is intended to remedy such limitation of the prior art sending driver from a power consumption standpoint. With such benefit, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *McClennon et al.* (US 6,721,355). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 11) recites a step of "in response to an amount of data that needed to be sent by said sender, adjusting a supply voltage level by said sensor to said sending driver accordingly," and a step of "transmitting data from said sender by said sending driver on said transmission line to said receiving driver according to said adjusted supply voltage level."

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed sensor is disclosed by *McClennon* in Figure 3 as a data traffic predictor 120, and that the claimed adjusting and transmitting steps are disclosed by *McClennon* in col. 4, lines 12 and 16, respectively.

In col. 7, lines 53-55, *McClennon* teaches that a data traffic monitor 122 within data traffic predictor 120 is utilized to monitor data arriving at a modem 20 to determine a data arrival rate (see block 202 in Figure 5). In contrast, the claimed adjusting step is performed "in response to an amount of data that needed to be sent by said sender." Since the claimed adjusting step is related to data sent instead of data received as taught by *McClennon*, *McClennon* does not teach or suggest the claimed adjusting step. In addition, *McClennon*'s determination of whether the arriving data is periodic or quasi-periodic (col. 7, lines 57-58) is also different from the claimed adjusting step that deals with "an amount of data that needed to be sent by said sender" because the periodicity of data is not relevant to its amount.

In Figure 8 along with col. 10, lines 51-58, *McClennon* teaches a power mode controller 126 within data traffic predictor 120 to be in a Quiescent Mode at a zero data rate when there is no incoming data (block 252) and in a Full On Mode when there is incoming data (block 254). Even though *McClennon* is related to receiving data instead of sending data, as explained above, the two modes (*i.e.*, either Full On or Quiescent at zero data rate) as taught by *McClennon* is exactly what the claimed invention is intended to improved. The claimed transmitting step allows data to be sent "according to said adjusted supply voltage level," which is more the two modes as taught by *McClennon*. The claimed adjusting and transmitting steps provide the benefits of the claimed invention, as explained above.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by *McClennon*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 11 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **09-0456**.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Antony P. Ng  
*Registration No. 43,427*  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS